

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 14-20, 22, 23, 25-28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent 5,084,870 to Hutchinson et al. (Hutchinson) in view of US Patent Application Publication 2004/0223460 by Eldridge et al. (Eldridge). Claims 3, 6, 13, 21, 24, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of US Patent Application Publication 2006/0153562 by Dolbec et al. (Dolbec). Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of US Patent 6,381,643 to Bartfai et al. (Bartfai).

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitation “...a comparison module configured to compare the new connection to a switch connection rule if the new connection is a switch connection, else comparing the new connection to a non-switch connection rule, each the connection rule defining a cabling connection, ~~wherein the connection rule depends on~~ a network topology, and a type of cabling...” The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 20, ¶ 80. Claims 14, 15, 19, 30, and 31 are similarly amended.

Claims 19 and 30 are also amended with the limitation of claim 20. Claim 20 is canceled.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 14-20, 22, 23, 25-28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge. Claims 3, 6, 13, 21, 24, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of Dolbec. Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of Bartfai. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 includes the limitations:

a detection module configured to detect a new connection at a network switch, the new connection facilitated by a first physical termination of a network cable, the network switch forming part of a data network;

a comparison module configured to **compare the new connection to a switch connection rule if the new connection is a switch connection, else comparing the new connection to a non-switch connection rule**, each connection rule defining a cabling connection, a network topology_a and a type of cabling; and

a cabling connection module configured to control authorization of a network communication over the new connection in accordance with the connection rule.

Independent claims 14, 15, 19, 30, and 31 include similar limitations. Applicants submit that Hutchinson and Eldridge, and also Bartfai, do not disclose comparing the new connection to a switch connection rule if the new connection is a switch connection, else comparing the new connection to a non-switch connection rule and therefore do not teach each element of the present invention.

Because Hutchinson and Eldridge do not disclose each element of claims 1, 14, 15, 19, 30, and 31, Applicants submit that claims 1, 14, 15, 19, 30, and 31 are allowable. Applicants

further submit that claims 2-13, 16-18, and 20-29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 23, 2008
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929